	Case 1:20-cv-01468-JLT-CDB Documen	it 38	Filed 12/22/23	Page 1 of 2
1				
2				
3				
4				
5				
6				
7				
8	UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT			
9	EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA			
10				
11	MATTHEW H. BECKETT,	1	No. 1:20-cv-01468	-JLT-CDB (PC)
12	Plaintiff,		ORDER ADOPTING FINDINGS AND RECOMMENDATIONS AND DENYING MOTION FOR RETURN OF PROPERTY	
13	v.	I		
14	SCALIA, et al.,	ľ		
15	Defendants.	(	Docs. 23, 27)	
16				
17	Matthew H. Beckett is a state prisoner proceeding pro se and in forma pauperis in this			
18	civil rights action filed under 42 U.S.C. § 1983. This matter was referred to a United States			
19	Magistrate Judge pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1)(B) and Local Rule 302.			
20	The Magistrate Judge issued findings and recommendations, which concluded that the			
21	Court should deny Plaintiff's motion for a return of property. (Doc. 27.) Because of the relief			
22	sought, the assigned Magistrate Judge construed the pleading as a motion for a preliminary			
23	injunction. (Id. at 1.)			
24	Plaintiff objects and states that he is seeking production of evidence and has made			
25	multiple attempts to obtain unspecified documents from the warden, the AG's office, and the			
26	court. (Doc. 28 at 1.) Plaintiff attaches to his objections numerous documents that appear to be			
27	filings in another case pending in this District in which he is the named plaintiff. Notably,			
28	Plaintiff does not dispute the Magistrate Judge's conclusion that the type of injunctive relief			

## Plaintiff requests (return of property) is different from the relief he seeks ultimately to be granted in this action. Nor does Plaintiff challenge that the Court lacks authority to grant Plaintiff his requested remedy absent a nexus between that remedy and the conduct asserted in the complaint. According to 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1)(C), this Court has conducted a de novo review of this case. Having carefully reviewed the entire file, including Plaintiff's objections, the Court concludes that the findings and recommendations are supported by the record and proper analysis. Thus, the Court ORDERS: The findings and recommendations issued on October 2, 2023, (Doc. 27), are 1, ADOPTED IN FULL. 2. Plaintiff's motion for a preliminary injunction, (Doc. 23), is **DENIED**. IT IS SO ORDERED. Dated: **December 22, 2023**

Case 1:20-cv-01468-JLT-CDB Document 38 Filed 12/22/23 Page 2 of 2